

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings include changes to Figs. 14-16. This sheet, which includes Figs. 14-16, replace the original sheet including Figs. 14-16. Replacement Figs. 14-16 are now label as “Conventional Art”.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Replacement Figures 14-16 are submitted with the present response that are now labeled "Conventional Art" as requested in the Office Action.

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-19 are pending in this application. Claims 8 and 11 are canceled by the present response without prejudice and claims 16-19 are added by the present response. Claims 1-4 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,700,798 to Shirasaki (herein "Shirasaki '789"). Claims 5, 10, 11, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,522,214 to Harju et al. (herein "Harju"). Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. patent 6,726,488 to Shirasaki (herein "Shirasaki '488"). Claims 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Harju in view of Shirasaki '488.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 1-4 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Shirasaki '789, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Applicants initially note claims 1-4 are amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein, and claim 15 is canceled by the present response without prejudice.

With respect to independent claim 1, independent claim 1 now clarifies that the width of an edge portion of the first high frequency transmission line is *less than* a width of another portion thereof. That subject matter is fully supported by the original specification for example in Figure 1(b). As shown in Figure 1(b) the width at the portion A of the high-frequency transmission line 3 is less than that at another portion thereof. That feature distinguishes over Shirasaki '789. In Shirasaki '789 the edge portions of the signal lines 3, 13, 23 are actually *wider* than at other portions thereof. Thus, Shirasaki '789 discloses a directly contrary structure than as now clarified in claim 1.

Further, claim 1 now clarifies that the second high frequency transmission line connects to the edge portion of the first high frequency transmission line “through a plurality of conductors provided to connect said edge portion of said first high frequency transmission line to said edge portion of said second high frequency transmission line”. Such subject matter is fully supported for example in Figure 2 of the present specification by the plural conductors 12. Such features are believed to also clearly distinguish over the applied art to Shirasaki ‘789. That is, Shirasaki ‘789 does not disclose any multiple conductors at such an edge portion of the first and second transmission lines as now recited in amended independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom.

In such ways, claims 1-4 are believed to clearly distinguish over Shirasaki ‘789.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 5, 10, 11, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Harju, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Each of claims 5 and 14 is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein, claim 11 being canceled without prejudice.

Specifically, independent claim 5 is amended by the present response to now incorporate the limitations from previously pending depending claim 8. Specifically, independent claim 5 now recites “wherein a width of said third signal line is set between said first signal line and said second signal line”. Independent claim 14 is similarly amended. With respect to that feature, the outstanding Office Action appears to cite the teachings in Shirasaki, as Shirasaki was cited with respect to features in dependent claims 6-9. However, applicants respectfully submit Shirasaki does not teach or suggest the above-noted feature.

The outstanding Official Action merely cites Shirasaki to disclose at column 7, lines 48-55 that the conductor width of one end of the line conductor W2 is made narrower than the width W1 of the line portion having a predetermined characteristic impedance. However, that teaching in Shirasaki does not disclose or even address the features now recited in each

of independent claims 5 and 14, specifically that “a width of said third signal line is set between said first signal line and said second signal line”. Thus, each of independent claims 5 and 14, and the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Shirasaki ‘488, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Independent claim 12 is amended by the present response to now further recite that the connection of the signal line of the second high frequency transmission line to the edge of the signal line of the first high frequency transmission line is “through a plurality of conductors provided to connect said edge portion of said first high frequency transmission line to said edge portion of said second high frequency transmission line”. Such a feature is already discussion above with respect to independent claim 1, and is believed to also clearly distinguish over Shirasaki ‘488. That is, as clearly shown in Shirasaki ‘488 a single conductor 5 is provided for the noted connections. Thus, claims 12 and 13 are believed to clearly distinguish over Shirasaki ‘488.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Harju in view of Shirasaki ‘488, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Claim 6 is amended by the present response to clarify a feature recited therein. It is respectfully submitted that no combination of teachings of Harju in view of Shirasaki ‘488 discloses the combination of feature that the edge portion of the first signal line connected to the first connection conductor having a line width *less than* the line width of another portion thereof.

In such ways, claims 6-9 are believed to clearly distinguish over Harju in view of Shirasaki ‘488.

The present response also sets forth new claims 16-19 for examination.

New claims 16 and 17 are dependent claims that recite a plurality of first and second connection conductors. The features therein are fully supported for example by Figure 3 in the present specification are believed to even further distinguish over the applied art.

New independent claim 18, and claim 19 dependent therefrom, are believed to also distinguish over the applied art.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit each of the claims as currently written distinguishes over the applied art.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS/rac

I:\ATTYSNS\25s\251774\251774US-AM.DOC